UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,737	11/25/2003	Bradley S. Galer	BSG 021 US	7300
GUY DONATIELLO ENDO PHARMACEUTICALS			EXAMINER	
			ARNOLD, ERNST V	
100 Endo Boulevard CHADDS FORD, PA 19317			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/722,737	GALER, BRADLEY S.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ERNST V. ARNOLD	1616
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ The Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and application Papers	awn from consideration.	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according to the drawing and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exercise 11.	ecepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat fority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

DETAILED ACTION

The finality of the prior Office Action is withdrawn. The current Examiner of record has a new ground of rejection.

Claims 1-11 are pending and under examination.

Withdrawn rejections:

Applicant's amendments and arguments filed 11/3/08 are acknowledged and have been fully considered. Any rejection and/or objection not specifically addressed below is herein withdrawn. The current Examiner of record is withdrawing the prior rejections in favor of the rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hind (US 5411738) as evidenced by MedlinePlus Medical Encyclopedia: Neuralgia.

Hind discloses methods for treating nerve injury such as post-herpetic neuralgia with topical application of lidocaine to the skin at the site of the pain (Abstract and claims 1-8). As evidenced by MedlinePlus Medical Encyclopedia: Neuralgia, which is

Application/Control Number: 10/722,737

Art Unit: 1616

also known as postherpetic neuralgia, the symptoms include pain and **numbness** of the affected skin area (See symptoms pages 1-2 of 4). Numbness is a neuropathically-induced negative sensory phenomena (See [0011] pages 3-4 of the instant specification). Therefore, the method of Hind inherently treats any neuropathically-induced negative sensory phenomena, such as numbness, because it is a symptom and associated with the disorder and instant claims 1-4 are anticipated. Hind discloses applying a patch which anticipates instant claim 5 (claims 2-6). Hind discloses from about 1-20% lidocaine which anticipates instants claim 6 and 7 (claim 5). Hind discloses a lidocaine patch with a non-woven polyester backing which anticipates instant claim 8 (column 15, lines 11-16 and claim 3). Hind discloses a method in column 15, lines 11-26:

Page 3

Study Drug and Placebo

Lidocaine patches (Lidoderm Patch) contain an adhesive of 5% lidocaine base (700 mg/patch), water, glycerin, D-sorbitol, sodium polyacrylate, sodium carboxymethylcellulose, propylene glycol and other ingretients on a non-woven polyester backing. Vehicle placebo patches are identical except for the absence of lidocaine. The size of a single patch is 10×14 cm.

Patch Application

Prior to patch application, the painful area to be 21 treated was marked and then photographed based on the subject's report of (1) the borders of the area of sensory abnormality, and (2) the area of greatest pain. Up to 3 patches were applied to cover the area of greatest pain as fully as possible within the limit of 420 cm² 2: Of patch area.

Since 'backing' is being interpreted to mean a cover and any numbness is inherently treated by the method then instant claims 9-11 are anticipated.

Application/Control Number: 10/722,737 Page 4

Art Unit: 1616

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind (US 5411738 (IDS filed on 4/30/04) in view of Wolicki (US 2004/0101582) as evidenced by MedlinePlus Medical Encyclopedia: Neuralgia.

Applicant claims a method for treating neuropathically-induced negative sensory phenomena comprising applying an anesthetic topically to the skin of a patient suffering from neuropathic negative sensory phenomena at or near the locus of the negative sensory phenomena.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art

(MPEP 2141.01)

Application/Control Number: 10/722,737 Page 5

Art Unit: 1616

The references of Hind and MedlinePlus are discussed in detail above and those discussions are hereby incorporated by reference.

Wolicki teaches in claim 6 the equivalence of various benzoic acid derivatives for the treatment of neuropathy:

6. The topical composition of claim 2, wherein said additional ingredient is selected from the group consisting of: capsaicin, lidocaine, bupivacaine, mepivacaine, ropivacaine, tetracaine, etidocaine, chloroprocaine, prilocaine, procaine, benzocaine, dibucaine, dyclonine hydrochloride, pramoxine hydrochloride, benzocaine, and proparacaine.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims

(MPEP 2141.02)

1. The difference between the instant application and Hind is that Hind do not expressly teach various benzoic acid derivatives in the method. This deficiency in Hind is cured by the teachings of Wolicki.

Finding of prima facie obviousness

Rational and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)

1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to add other benzoic acid derivatives, as suggested by Wolicki, to the method of Hind and produce the instant invention.

Page 6

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the art teaches the benzoic acid derivatives to be equivalent in methods of treating neuropathy. The expected result remains treatment of the neuropathy.

In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ernst V. Arnold whose telephone number is 571-272-8509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:15 am-4:45 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/722,737 Page 7

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Ernst V Arnold/ Examiner, Art Unit 1616